Doctor HAMMOND
his
ἘΚΤΕΝΕΣΤΕΡΟΝ,
or
A greater Ardency in Christ's love of God at one time, than another

PROVED TO BE UTTERLY IRRECONCILEABLE

With

1. *His fulneſſe of habituall grace.*
2. *The perpetuall happineſſe, and*
3. *The impeccability of his ſoule.*

By HENRY IEANES, Miniſter of Gods Word at *Chedzoy* in Somerſet-ſhire.

OXFORD,
Printed by HENRY HALL, Printer to the UNIVERSITY, for THOMAS ROBINSON. 1657.

Doctor *HAMMOND*,

1. I Was very willing to hearken to the *seasonable* advice of many, and to wholly *withdraw* my selfe *à foro contentioso*, to some more *pleasing*, and *profitable* imployment; but discerning it to be the *desire* of the *Author* of the Booke, intituled, *A mixture of Scholasticall and Practicall Divinity*, that I should *reply* to his *examination* of one passage of mine against *Mr Cawdrey*, I shall make no scruple immediately to *obey* him; not only because it may be done in very *few* words, but especially because the *doctrine* which he affixeth to me, seems (and not without some *reason*) to be contrary to the *truth* of *Scripture*, which I am to looke on with all *reverent* submission, *& acquiesce in*, with *captivation* of *understanding*, and so not assert any thing from mine *owne* conceptions, which is but seemingly *contrary* to it.

2. The proposition which he *affixes* to me, is this; *That Christs Love of God was capable of further degrees*, and that he refutes as a thing *contrary to that point* (a *truth* of *Scripture*) which he had in hand; *viz.* The *dwelling of fulnesse of all habituall Grace in Christ*.

3. By this I suppose I may conclude his meaning to be, that I have affirmed *Christs Love* of *God* (meaning thereby that *habituall grace* of *divine Charity*) to have been *capable of further degrees*, so as that *capacity* of *further degrees*, is the *deniall* of *all-fulnesse of that habituall grace* already in him.

4. And truly, had I thus *expresst* my selfe, or let fall any words, which might have been thus *interpretable*, I acknowledg I had been very *injurious* not only to the *verity* of *God*, but also to my *own conceptions*, and even to the *cause* which I had in hand, which had not been *supported*, but *betrayed* by any such apprehensions of the *imperfection of Christs habituall graces*.

5. This I could easily shew, and withall how *cautiously* and *expres-*

ſly it was *foreſtall'd* by me; But to the matter in hand, it is ſufficient, that I profeſſe I never thought it; but deem it a *contrariety* to expreſſe words of *Scripture* in any man who ſhall think it, and in ſhort, that I never gave *occaſion* to any man to *believe* it my opinion, having never ſaid it in *thoſe* words which he ſets up to *refute* in mee, never in any *other* that may be reaſonably *interpretable* to that ſenſe.

ſ E A N E S.

Whereas you terme your compliance with my deſire, that you ſhould reply unto me, *Obedience*; I looke upon it as a very high *Complement*; (for what am I, that my deſire ſhould have with you the authority of a Command?) and ſhall not be ſo uncharitable, as to thinke it a ſcoffe, though ſome of my friends have repreſented it to me under that notion: but ſuppoſe it were meant in way of deriſion, yet this ſhall abate nothing of my gratitude for your reply, which is a favour, and honour, of which I willingly confeſſe my ſelfe to be unworthy.

The beſt teſtimony I can give you of my thankfulneſſe is, to aſſure you, that if in the exceptions, which you ſhall condeſcend to returne unto this paper, you can prove that I have done you any injury, you ſhall find me very ready to make you ſatisfaction. But if on the contrary you ſhall fayle in ſuch proofe, I hope you will be ſo much a friend unto the truth, as to retract your miſtake.

You acknowledg, that to affirme, that *Chriſt's habituall love of God was capable of farther degrees, is a contrariety to expreſſe words of Scripture.* Now this propoſition, which you thus diſclaime, is the naturall, and unavoidable ſequele of that which you in this your reply §. 21 confeſſe to be your opinion; to wit, *that the inward acts of Chriſt's love were more intenſe at one time than another:* and this I ſhall make good by an argument, which I ſhall ſubmit unto your ſevereſt examination.

Intenſion & remiſſion are primarily, & *per ſe*, only of qualities; ſo that

that an action is not capable of degrees of intension and remission, but secondarily, and *mediante qualitate*; in regard of that qualitie, which it produceth, or from which it proceedeth *ratione* [a] *termini*, or *ratione principii*. The intension and remission of actions therefore must be proportioned unto that of those qualities, which they regard, either as their termes, or principles; now you acknowledge *in terminis*, that the inward acts of Christs love were more intense at one time than at another; and hereupon it undeniably, and unavoidably followeth, that either the *terminus*, some quality that was the product of these inward acts of love, or else the *principium*, some qualitie that was the principle of them was more intense at one time, than at another.

(a) Collegium Compl. De generat. & corrupt. disp. 4. qu. 5. §. 11. n. 47. Scheib. Metaph. l. 2. c. 12. num. 35. 36.

If you say, that the *terminus*, some quality, that was the product of these inward acts, was more intense at one time, than another; why then, first, you must tell us what this quality is, and in what *Species* of quality it is placed; it cannot with any colour of probability be ranked under any other of the foure *species* of quality than the first; and if it be put there, it must be either *dispositio* or *habitus*; now *dispositio* is such an imperfect and inchoate a thing, as that I am very loath to think so dishonourably of my Saviour, as to ascribe it to him. If you make it an habit, then you will run upon that opinion which you disowne; for it can be no other than a morall habit, and therefore in Christ it must be a vertuous & gracious habit. To affirme therefore that this quality was more intense at one time than at another, will be by just consequence to affirme, that a gracious habit in Christ was more intense at one time than another. 2 *Entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate*: and therefore I shall reject this quality *è numero entium*, unlesse you can by convincing arguments prove a necessity of asserting it. I am not ignorant, that it is a common opinion, that *omnis actio habet terminum*; but how it failes in immanent actions,

you may see (if you will vouchsafe to stoope so low) in *Schiebelers Metaphysicks* l.2.c.10.t.3.ar.3.pun.1.

If you take the other way, and say that the principle, the quality producing these inward acts of Christs love of God, was more intense at one time than at another; why then you grant that which you seeme to deny; for the principle of them is nothing else but the habituall grace, or habit of divine love; and therefore if you averre that to have been capable of farther intension, you averre that the habituall grace of Christ was capable of farther intension, and thus you see what the reason was that induced me to charge you with this opinion.

Doctor H A M M O N D.

6. *First*, I said it not in *those* words, which he undertakes to *refute*; These are p. 258. of his *Book* thus set down by him.

" *This point may serve for confutation of a passage in* Dr. *H. against* " Mr. *C. to wit, That Christs love of God was capable of farther degrees.*

7. These words I never said, nor indeed are they to be found in the *Passage* which he sets down from me, and whereon he grounds them; which, saith he, is this:

Dr. *H.* p. 222.

In the next place he passeth to the inforcement of my argument, from what we read concerning Christ himselfe, that he was more intense in Prayer at one time than another, when yet the lower degree was sure no sin, and prepares to make answer to it. viz. *That Christ was above the Law, and did more than the Law required, but men fall short by many degrees of what is required. But sure this answer is nothing to the matter now in hand, for the evidencing of which, that example of Christ was brought by me,* viz. *That sincere Love is capable of degrees. This was first shewed in severall men, and in the same man at severall times, in the severall rankes of Angells, and at last in Christ himselfe more ardent in one act of Prayer than in another.*

8. Here the *Reader* finds not the words [*Christs love of God is capable of further degrees*] and when by *deduction* he endeavours to *conclude* them from these words, his *conclusion* falls *short* in *one* word *viz.* [*further*] and 'tis but this,

That the example of Christ will never prove D. H. his conclusion, unlesse it inferre, that Christs love of God was capable of degrees.

9. This is but a *slight* charge indeed, yet may be worthy to be ta

ken

ken *notice* of in the entrance (though the *principall* weight of my *answer* be not laid on it) and ſuggeſt this *ſeaſonable* advertiſement, that he which undertakes to *refute* any ſaying of *another*, muſt oblige himſelfe to an *exact recitall* of it to a *word*, and *ſyllable*; Otherwiſe he may himſelfe become the only *Author* of the Propoſition, which he *refutes*.

10. The *difference* is no more than by the *addition* of the word, [*further*.] But that addition may poſſibly beget in the *Readers underſtanding*, a very *conſiderable* difference.

11. For this Propoſition [*Chriſts love of God was capable of further degrees*] is readily interpretable to this *dangerous* ſenſe, that *Chriſts love of God was not full*, but ſo farre *imperfect*, as to be *capable of ſome further degrees* than yet it *had*; And thus ſure the *Author* I have now before me, acknowledges to have *underſtood* the words, and accordingly propoſeth to *refute* them from the conſideration of *the all-fulneſſe of habituall grace in Chriſt*, which he could not do, unleſſe he deemed them a *prejudice* to it.

12. But thoſe *other* words, which though he finds not in my *papers*, he yet not *illogically* inferres from them [*that Chriſts love of God was capable of degrees, more intenſe at one time than at another*] are not ſo *liable* to be thus interpreted, but only import that *Chriſts love of God* had in its *latitude* or *amplitude* ſeverall *degrees*, one differing from another. See *magis & minus*, all of them comprehended in that *all-full perfect love of God*, which was alwaies in *Chriſt* ſo *full*, and ſo *perfect*, as not to *want*, and ſo not to be *capable* of *further degrees*.

13. The Matter is cleare; The *degrees* of which *Chriſts love of God* is capable; are by me thus expreſt, that *his love was more intenſe at one time than at another*; but ſtill the *higher* of thoſe *degrees* of *intenſneſſe*, was as truly acknowledged to be in *Chriſts love*, at *ſome* time, *viz.* in his *agonie*, as the *lower* was at *another*, and ſo *all* the *degrees*, which are ſuppoſed to be mentioned of his *love*, are alſo *ſuppoſed*, and *expreſly* affirmed to have been *in him* at ſome time or other, whereas a ſuppoſed *capacity of further degrees*, *ſeemes* at leaſt (and ſo is reſolved by *that Author*) to *inferre*, that theſe *degrees* were *not* in *Chriſt* (the direct *contradictorie* to the *former* Propoſition) and ſo that they were *wanting* in him, and the but *ſeeming* aſſerting of that *want* is juſtly *cenſured*, as *prejudiciall* to *Chriſts fulneſſe*. Here then was one *miſadventure* in his proceeding.

IEANES.

1. He that ſaith that Chriſts love of God was more intenſe in his agonie than before, affirmeth, that his love of God before his agonie was capable of farther degrees, than yet it had; but you affirme the former, and therefore I doe you no wrong to impute the latter unto you: The premiſes virtually containe the concluſion, and therefore he that holds the premiſes, maintaineth the concluſion. I ſhall readily hearken to your ſeaſonable advertiſement, that *he, which undertakes to refute any ſaying of anothers, muſt oblige himſelfe to an exact recitall of it to a word and ſyllable*; but notwithſtanding it, I ſhall aſſume the libertie to charge you with the conſequences of your words, and if I cannot make good my charge, the ſhame will light on me.

2. If there were any miſtake in ſupplying the word [*farther*] it was a miſtake of charity, for I was ſo charitable, as to thinke that you ſpake pertinently to the matter you had in hand: I conceived that your ſcope in your treatiſe of will-worſhip was to prove, that there be uncommanded degrees of the love of God, that thoſe large incluſive words *thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy ſoule &c.* do not command the higheſt and moſt intenſe degree of the love of God; ſo that a man may fulfill this command, and yet there may be roome or place for *farther* and higher degrees of the love of God. Now this propoſition, Chriſts love of God was capable of degrees, which you confeſſe to be not illogically inferred from your papers will never reach this point, unleſſe you underſtand the word *farther*, and therefore your cenſure of my ſupplying the word *farther* as a miſadventure in my proceeding is groundleſſe.

Dr *HAMMOND.*

14. But this is but the *proemial* part of my *Reply*, there is a more *materiall* part of it ſtill behind, which may yet ſeeme *neceſſary* to be *added*, viz. to mind him of (what he well knowes) the *diſtinction* between *habits* and *acts of vertues*, or *graces*; and that *love*, the *Genus*, doth

doth equally *comprehend* both these *species*, and that his *discourse* of *all-fulnesse* belonging to the *habituall grace* of *Christ*, *I* speake distinctly of *another* matter, *viz.* of the *degreess of* that *grace* discernable in the *severall acts* of it.

JEANES.

The distinction between *the habits and acts of virtues or graces* I very well know; but that *love* as a *genus* doth *equally comprehend* the habit and act of love, is a thing which I confesse that I am yet to learne, and if it be a matter of ignorance in me, you must blame my Mr Aristotle, for he hath misguided me herein. He tels me *lib.* 1. *top. c.* 15. *n.* 11. that if a word be predicated of things put in severall predicaments, that then it is *homonymous* in regard of them, Σκοπεῖν δεῖ καὶ τὰ γένη τῶν κατὰ τοὐνομα κατηγοριῶν, εἰ ταῦτά ἐστιν ἐπὶ πάντων, εἰ γὰρ μὴ ταῦτα, δῆλον ὅτι ὁμώνυμον τὸ λεγόμενον. Now the *habit of love* is in the predicament of Quality, the *act* of love in the predicament of Action, and hereupon I cannot but conclude that the predication of love, concerning the *habit*, and the *act*, is onely equivocall, and consequently *love* no *genus* to them. No *genus* can equally comprehend those things which do differ *toto genere*, and are therefore termed *primo diversa*, rather then *differentia*; but now such are the habits and the acts of the love of God, and therefore love as *à genus* doth not equally comprehend them as it's *species*.

Dr HAMMOND.

15. This *distinction* I thought legible enough before; both in the *Tract* of *Will-worship* and in the *Answer* to Mr *Caw*.

16. In the former the *Refuter* confesseth to find it, *reciting* these words of mine, *It is possible for the same person constantly to love God above all, and yet to have higher expressions of that love at one one time than another.* Where the *expressions at one time*, and at *another*, must needs referre to the *severall acts* of the same, *all-full habituall love.* pag. 259.

JEANES.

The *distinction*, which you thought *legible enough before in your tract of will-worship*, in which you say that I *confesse*

to find it, is such a distinction between the *habits* and *acts* of love, as that love equally comprehends them both as *species*. Now I utterly deny, that there is any such distinction in those words of yours, which I recite: *It is possible for the same person constantly to love God above all, and yet to have higher expressions of that love at one time than another*: and the reason of this my deniall is, because *love*, as a *genus*, doth not comprehend the expressions of love equally with the habit. (1) Nothing can as a *genus* be equally predicated of things put in severall predicaments, but the habit of love, and expressions of love are put in severall predicaments; therefore love, as a *genus*, doth not equally comprehend them both. (2) The habit of love is formally and intrinsecally love; the expressions of love (that is, as you expound your selfe §. 21, the *outward expressions of the inward acts of* love) are termed love only by extrinsecall denomination from the inward acts of love; and therefore love doth not as a *genus* equally comprehend the habit, and the expressions of love. *Raynaudus in Mor: discip. dist. 3. N. 144.* make smention out of *Gab. Biel* of a distinction of love into *affective*, and *effective*: and what is this effective love but the effects and expressions of love? but now, that he doth not take this to be a proper distribution of a *genus* into it's *species*, appeareth by what he saith out of the same Author concerning the division. *Effectivum dicit ipsum illius amoris eliciti effectum. Translato quippe causæ nomine ad effectum, is dicitur amare effectivè, qui non ostentat infertilem ac sterilem amorem; sed cum se dat occasio, erumpit in fructus dignos amoris. Quam esse admodùm impropriam amoris divisionem fatetur Gabriel, quia amare propriè est in solâ voluntate tanquam in subjecto: ea autem productio effectuum amoris in aliis facultatibus cernitur, estque actus transiens, non immanents voluntatis.* (3) No one word can as a *genus* eqnally comprehend the efficient and the effect; the habit of love is the efficient cause, and the sincere and cordiall expressions of

love

love are the effect; therefore love is not predicated of them equally as a *genus*. (4) That which is predicated properly of one thing, and tropically of another cannot equally comprehend them both as a *genus*; but love is predicated properly of the habit of love, tropically, viz. Metonymically of the expreſſions of love, by a metonymie of the efficient for the effect; therefore love as a genus cannot equally comprehend them both.

D. *HAMMOND.*

Onely I gueſſe not what *temptation* he had to chooſe that *expreſſion*, which he there makes uſe of, *viz.* [*That there D. H. minceth the matter, and ſpeaketh more cautelouſly*] adding [*that what he there ſaith is nothing to the matter now in hand.*] Whereas 1. thoſe of *Will-worſhip* being the *Firſt papers* written on *that* ſubject, are ſure very *pertinent* to aſcertain him of the meaning of the *latter*, written in *defence* of them.

JEANES.

That *your firſt papers written on this ſubject are* very impertinent to *aſcertaine me of the meaning of your latter* is eaſily diſcernable unto any man, that will compare both together; however I ſhall offer unto your conſideration two reaſons, to prove the impertinency of them for that purpoſe. (1) In your firſt papers you ſpeak only of the *expreſſions of love* (i.e.) as you interpret your ſelfe, *the outward expreſſions of the inward acts of love:* in your latter papers you ſpeak of *love it ſelfe*: now the *outward expreſſions of love* are termed love only *extrinſecè, denominativè, & participativè*, from the inward act of love, as ſome ſay the imperate acts of the will, are ſaid to be in this ſenſe only free or voluntary. 2ly, That your firſt papers are very ſhort, in explaining the meaning of your latter, is apparent by this your reply, wherein you extend the *love of God*, which you affirme to be *capable of degrees*, beyond the *outward expreſſions*, unto the very *inward acts of love*.

Dr. *HAMMOND.*

And 2ly, the *early cautelous* ſpeaking there, might have made *further latter caution* unneceſſary.

ℱ *E A N E S.*

I had thought that in polemicall writings, it had ſtill been needfull for a man to continue on his caution, for otherwiſe he may expoſe himſelfe unto blowes, and knocks, which he never *dream't* off. *Earely cautelous ſpeaking* is no *ſalvo* unto after unwarineſſe.

Dr. *H A M M O N D.*

And 3ly, I could not be ſaid to *mince*, (which to *vulgar* eares ſignifies to *retract* in ſome degrees, what I had ſaid before,) and againe *ſpeak more cautiouſly*, when that was the *firſt* time of my ſpeaking of it.

ℱ *E A N E S.*

I am very loath to enter into a Conteſt with ſo great a Critick, touching the meaning of a word, however I ſhall adventure to ſay thus much, that a man may be ſaid to *mince* a matter, and *ſpeak more cautiouſly* at the firſt time of ſpeaking of it, than afterwards at a ſecond time of ſpeaking of it: neither ſhall I be beaten from this mine aſſertion, by your bare and naked affirmation, that to *mince, to vulgar eares, ſignifieth to retract in ſome degrees what hath been ſaid before:* for I appeale to both *vulgar and learned* eares, whether or no we may not ſay truly of divers erroneous perſons, that in the firſt broaching of their errors they *mince* the matter, and ſpeak more *cautelouſly* than afterwards, when they are fleſhed and incouraged with ſucceſſe.

Dr. *H A M M O N D.*

17. Mean-while it is *manifeſt*, and his own *confeſſion*, that *there theſe were my words*, and thoſe ſo *cautious*, that *this* ſenſe of the words which he undertakes to *refute*, could not be *affixt* on them. And this I ſhould have thought ſufficient to have preſerved my *innocence*, and *forſtalled* his *Uſe* of *Confutation.*

ℱ *E A N E S.*

Suppoſe that in your tract of will-worſhip, theſe were your words, and withall that they were ſo *cautious* that this ſenſe of the words, which I undertake to refute, could not be affixt on them, yet this is nothing at all unto the purpoſe, and contributes

tributes nothing to the clearing of your *innocence*, *and foreſtalling my uſe of confutation*; and the reaſon hereof is very evident, becauſe that which I undertook to refute, was affixt by me, not on theſe your ſo *cautelous words* in your tract of will-worſhip, but on a paſſage in your anſwer to Mr. *Cawdrey*. Indeed I cenſured thoſe your words in themſelves impertinent unto your matter in hand, and withall proved them to be ſo. But if you had gone no farther then theſe words, you ſhould not have heard from me touching this ſubject; for time is more pretious with me, than to waſt it, in medling meerely with the impertinencies of any mans diſcourſe.

Dr. *HAMMOND.*

18. But the *anſwer* to *M. C.* which occaſioned it was, I think, as *cautious* alſo, 1. In the words recited by the *Refuter*, *viz.* that *Chriſt himſelfe was more ardent in one act of prayer than in another.* 2. In the words following in that *anſwer*, but not *recited* by him, *viz.* that the *ſincerity of this or that virtue expreſt in this or that performance, is it we ſpeake of, when we ſay it conſiſts in a latitude, and hath degrees*; where the [*this or that performance*] *are* certainly *Acts* of the *virtue*, conſiſting in a *latitude*, and the having *degrees* (*viz.* in that *latitude*) no way implies him that hath *virtue* in that *latitude* (*viz. Chriſt*) to *want* at preſent, and in that ſenſe to be *capable of farther degrees.*

19. I am willing to look as *jealouſly* as I can on any paſſage of my own, which falls under any mans *cenſure*: and therefore finding nothing in the words (*ſet down* by him as the *ground* of the *Refutation*) which is any way *capable* of it, I have reviewed the *whole ſection*, and weighed every *period*, as *ſuſpicioonſly* as I could; to *obſerve* whether I could *draw* or *wreſt* that *conſequence* from any *other* paſſage, not *recited* by him.

20. And I find none in *any* degree *liable*, except it ſhould be this in the beginning of the *Sect.* Where ſetting down the *argument*, as it lay in the *Tr. of Will-wor.* I ſay *tis poſſible for the ſame perſon which ſo loves God* (i. e. *with all the heart*) *to love him, and expreſſe that love more intenſely at one time than another, as appeared by the example of Chriſt.*

21. And if this be thought *capable* of *miſapprehenſion*, by reaſon of the [and] *disjoyning love* from the *expreſſions* of it, and ſo the *expreſſions* belonging to the *acts*, the *love* be deemed to denote the *habituall love*;

I muſt onely ſay, that is a *miſapprehenſion*; for that by *loving with all the heart*, in *the firſt* place, I certainly meant the *ſincere habit* of *Love*, by *love* in the *latter* place, the inward *acts* of *love*, and by the *expreſſions* of *love*, the *outward expreſſions* of thoſe *inward acts*, and of *thoſe acts* onely I ſpeak, and of *thoſe expreſſions*, when I ſay they are *more intenſe at one time than another*.

FEANES.

I ſhall here briefly repreſent unto you that which made me think you guilty of detracting from the *all-fulneſs of Chriſts habituall grace*, and referre you for confirmation hereof unto what I have ſaid in the beginning of this my diſcourſe. The undeniable conſequence of what you ſay in anſwer unto Mr. *Cawdrey* is, as I have proved, *that Chriſts love of God was capable of farther degrees*. Now hereupon I thus reaſoned in my mind, you were to be underſtood either of the habit, or of the inward act of love, for as for the outward expreſſions of love, it is without diſpute, that they cannot be ſaid to be love properly, but only by a trope; if you ſhould have ſaid that you ſpake of the habit of love, then you would have expreſly impugned the all-fulneſſe of Chriſts habituall grace; and if you ſhould ſay, as you now do, that you meant the inward acts of love; why then I concluded that you would even hereby *implyedly and by conſequence* have oppoſed the perfection of Chriſts habituall grace, becauſe the intenſion of the inward acts of love proceedeth from the intenſion of the habit of love, and is therefore proportioned unto it: but of this more fully in the place above mentioned. Thus having ſhewed you what invited me unto my uſe of confutation, I ſhall paſſe over the three other ſections, which you your ſelfe I preſume would have ſpared, if you had been privy unto that which I now acquaint you with.

Dr. *HAMMOND.*

22. The word *love*, as I ſaid, is a *genus*, equally comprehending the *two ſpecies*, *habituall* and *actuall love*, and equally applicable to either of the *ſpecies*, to the *acts* as well as the *habit* of *love*. And ſo when I ſay *love* is *capable* of *degrees*, the meaning is cleare, The *genericall* word *love*

ove restrained to the *latter species*, *is* considered in respect of the *acts* of *love*, *gradually* differenced one from the other, is in that *respect*, *capable of degrees*, both *inwardly* and in *outward expressions*: that *act* of *love*, that poured out and exprest it selfe in the *more ardent prayer*, was a more *intense act* of *love*, than another *act* of the same *habituall love*, which did not so *ardently expresse* it selfe.

JEANES.

That love is not a *genus* equally comprehending *habituall* and *actuall* love, as its two *species*, I have already proved by this argument, because they are in severall *predicaments*; habituall love in the *predicament* of *qualitie*, and *actuall* in the *predicament* of *action*. There are, I know, divers great *Philosophers* and *Schoolemen* that make all *immanent acts*, and consequently all *inward acts* of love to be *qualities*; they are, say they, only *grammaticall actions*, not *metaphysicall actions* in the *predicament of action*; but this opinion is *untrue* in it selfe, and no waies *advantageous* unto your cause in hand.

1. It *is untrue in* it selfe; and to confirme this, I shall offer to your consideration two arguments out of *Scheibler*, which clearely prove immanent acts to be true, proper, and predicamentall actions, in the predicament of Action. *In universum id sine incommodo potest dici actio, quod sufficit ad constituendam causalitatem efficientis: Atqui dantur causæ efficientes, quibus non convenit alia causalitas, quam quæ actio immanens: Ergo actio immanens verè est actio. Propositio patet, quia prædicamentum actionis ponitur ad dicandam causalitem efficientis causæ in genere entium, ut supra disputatum, explicando divisionem prædicamentorum. Et confirmatur quod actio sit adæquata causalitas efficientis ut supra visum est, lib. 1. c. 12. Assumptio patet. Nam primo absolutè est causa efficiens in quantum denominatur videre aut intelligere. Et tamen isti sunt actus immanentes.* That which is the causality of an efficient cause is

a true and predicamentall action in the predicament of action: but immanent acts are the causalities of efficient causes, and therefore proper and predicamentall actions. *Deinde ad actus immanentes sunt potentiæ activæ, sed potentiæ activæ sunt per ordinem ad veras actiones, ergo actus immanentes sunt verè actiones. Et si hi solum titulotenus sunt actiones. Ergo etiam potentiæ illæ activæ titulotenus sunt potentiæ activæ.* That which terminates and actuates an active power is a proper and predicamentall action: but every immanent act terminates and actuates an active power; and therefore every immanent act is a proper and predicamentall action, *Met. lib. 2. cap. 10. n. 27.* You may perhaps slight *Scheibler*, as a trivial author, but I urge his *reasons*, not his *authority*, & if you can answer his reasons, you may speake your pleasure of him and of me for alleadging of him. But I can presse you with the authority of an author far greater than *Scheibler*, our great *Master Aristotle*, of whom you make somewhere in your writings honorable mention; he *l. 10. Ethic. c. 3.* tells us roundly, that the operations of virtues, & even happinesse it selfe, are not qualities οὐδὲ γὰρ αἱ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐνέργειαι ποιότητές εἰσιν οὐδὲ ἡ εὐδαιμονία, but these are immanent acts, & therefore in his opinion immanent acts are not qualities. But, secondly, suppose this opinion were true in it selfe, yet will it no waies advantage your cause, for the patrons of it rang *immanent acts* under the first *species of* quality and then they are either *dispositions* or *habits*. If you say they are *dispositions*, as most of the above mentioned schooleme hold them to be; against this I *object*, that however they may be so in other men, yet they cannot be so in Christ for a disposition carrieth in it's notion inchoation, and imperfection, and therefore to attribute it unto Christ is to throw an apparent dishonour upon him. If you say they are *habits*, why then, you cannot deny them to be *gracious habits*, and so you will fall upon that opinion, of which in the reply, you so studiously endeavour to acquit your selfe, viz. that *the same habits of grace in Christ may be more in*

ten-

tenſe at one time than another, and conſequently that his habituall grace was not alwaies full and perfect.

Dr. *HAMMOND.*

23. I ſhall explain this by the *Refuters* own *Confeſſion*. The *death of Chriſt*, ſaith he, *was an higher expreſſion of Chriſts love of us, than his poverty, hunger or thirſt.* To this I ſubjoyne, that ſuch as the expreſſion was, ſuch was the *act* of *inward love*, of which that was an *expreſſion:* it being certain that each of theſe *expreſſions* had an *act* of *internall love*, of which they were ſo many *proportionably different expreſſions*; And from hence I ſuppoſe it unavoidably *conſequent*, that that *act* of *internall love*, expreſt by his *dying* for us, was ſuperior to thoſe *former acts*, which onely expreſt themſelves in his *poverty*, and ſo the ſame perſon that *loved ſincerely*, did alſo *love*, and *expreſſe that love more intenſly at one time than at another*, which was the very thing I had ſaid in *another* inſtance. But this I have added *ex abundanti* more than the *Refuters* diſcourſe *required* of me.

JEANES.

If you had repeated that which you call my confeſſion full and intire, as it lay in my book, the impartiall and unprejudiced reader would ſoone have diſcerned that there was in it nothing that made for your advantage: my words at large are theſe, *There may be a graduall difference in the expreſſions of the ſame love for degree. Chriſts death for us was an higher expreſſion of his love of us, than his poverty, hunger, thirſt &c. and yet they might proceed from a love equally intenſe.* Now Sir have you ſaid any thing to prove, that they could not proceed from a love equally intenſe? you ſeeme indeed, moſt vehemently and affectionately to affirme that they could not; but you muſt pardon me, if I entertaine not your *vehement aſſeverations*, as *ſolid arguments*, as if they were *propoſitiones per ſe notæ*. Pray Sir, review this ſection, and put your argument into ſome forme; if you can make good that it containeth any diſproofe of what I have ſaid, unleſſe *begging of the queſtion* be argumentative, you ſhall have my hearty leave to triumph over me as you pleaſe; however untill then, I ſhall take your words aſunder, and examine every paſſage in them.

D. *HAMMOND.*

To this I ſubjoyn that ſuch as the expreſſion was, ſuch was the *act* of *inward love*, of which that was an *expreſſion*, yet being certain that each of theſe *expreſſions* had an *act* of *internall love*, of which they were ſo many *proportionably different expreſſions.*

IEANES.

That each of theſe expreſſions had an act of *inward love*, of which they were ſo many *different expreſſions*, is an obvious truth, but impertinent unto the matter in hand, unleſſe you can prove that they were of neceſſity equall in point of intenſion; and the proofe of this you have not hitherto ſo much as attempted.

Dr. *HAMMOND.*

And from hence I ſuppoſe it unavoidably *conſequent*, that that *act* of *internall love*, expreſt by his *dying* for us, was ſuperior to thoſe *former acts*, which onely expreſt themſelves in his *poverty*, and ſo the ſame perſon that *loved ſincerely*, did alſo *love*, and *expreſſe that love more intenſly at one time than at another*, which was the very thing I had ſaid in *another* inſtance. But this I have added *ex abundanti* more than the *Refuters* diſcourſe *required* of me.

IEANES.

From hence: whence I pray? if from the words immediately foregoing, then your argument ſtands thus. *Every of theſe expreſſions had an act of internall love, of which they were ſo many proportionably different expreſſions: therefore that act of internall love expreſt by his dying for us, was ſuperior to theſe former acts, which onely expreſt themſelves in his poverty.* And here I muſt profeſſe that the reaſon of your conſequence is to me inviſible, and I ſhall never acknowledg your inference legitimate untill you drive me hereunto, by reducing your *Enthymeme* unto a *Syllogiſme*; but perhaps there may be ſome myſtery in the word *proportionably*, and your meaning may be, that theſe different expreſſions in regard of intenſion muſt be proportioned exactly unto their inward reſpective acts of love equall or paralell unto them; and if this be your meaning, then your argument is guilty of that *fallacy*, which

is

is called *petitio principii*. It is my desire and purpose to have faire wars with you, and my pen shall not drop a disrespective syllable of you; but yet I am resolved to swallow none of your proofelesse dictates: seeing you have entered the lists with me, you must not think me irreverent and saucy, if (as the souldiers speak) I dispute every inch of ground with you, and be so bold as to call upon you for the proofe of whatsoever you assert touching that which is in controversy betwixt us.

Dr. *HAMMOND.*

24. It now onely remaines, that I consider whether this *Refuter* have in the *processe* of his *discourse* added any thing, wherein I may be any whit *concerned.*

25. And 1. saith he, *the falsehood of such an assertion is evident from the point there handled and confirmed, the absolute fulnesse of Christs grace, which by the generall consent of the Fathers and Schoolemen was such, as that it excluded all intensive growth.*

26. But to this the *reply* will be easily *foreseen*, from the *premisses*, that as the point by him *handled and confirmed* was distinctly the *all-fulnesse of habituall grace in Christ*, so his *proofs* of it by the *consent of Fathers and School-men* belong still to that *fulnesse of habituall grace.*

27. Witnesse one for all, *Aquinas* [illegible]. 3. *qu.* 7. *art.* 12. *ad secundum. Licet virtus divina possit facere aliquid majus & melius quàm sit habitualis gratia Christi, non tamen—though the divine power may make somewhat greater and better than is the habituall grace of Christ, yet*—so 'tis plain he speaks of the *fulnesse* of the *habituall grace.* And *ad tertium. In sapientia & gratia aliquis proficere potest dupliciter; uno modo secundùm ipsos habitus sapientiæ & gratiæ augmentatos, & sic Christus in eis non proficiebat. Alio modo secundùm effectus, in quantum aliquis sapientiora & virtuosiora opera facit, & sic Christus proficiebat sapientiâ & gratiâ; sicut & ætate, quia secundùm processum ætatis perfectiora opera faciebat,—& in his quæ sunt ad Deum, & in his quæ sunt ad homines. One may increase in wisdome and grace two waies, one way according to the habits of them increased, and so Christ increased not; another way, according to the effects; when any doth more wise and virtuous workes; and so Christ increased in Wisdome and Grace, as he did in age, because according to the processe of his age, he did more perfect workes, and that both in things belonging to God, and men also.*

28. And thus are the *School-men* understood by the *Refuter* himselfe, in his producing their *testimonies*, as appeares by the *expresse* words [*habituall grace* p. 260. lin. *penult.* and *holinesse*, and the *Image of God in him*] p. 261. lin. 13. And so 'tis most cleare, their *consent* belongs not, even in his *own* opinion, to the matter I had, and have in hand, no way *denying* but *asserting* a *capacity* of *degrees* among the *acts* of *Christs* love of *God*, and the *expressions* of it.

ANSWERS.

1. They that can so easily foresee this your reply, may with as little difficulty foreknow the objection against it, to wit, that the *intension of Christs actuall grace is exactly proportioned unto that of his habituall grace*; and therefore your deniall of the perpetuall all-fulnesse of Christs actuall grace, is a virtuall and implied deniall of the all-fulnesse of Christs habituall grace: and how you are provided of an answer hereunto, the event will shew. It is not then so cleare as you pretend, that the testimony of the Schoole-men belongs not, even in mine own opinion, to the matter you had and have in hand.

2. As for that place you quote out of *Aquinas*, it is plaine that therein by the effects of wisedome and grace are meant such as are outward, for these are most properly termed works. And besides, an *intensive increase* in the inward acts of wisedome and grace would argue and presuppose an *intensive increase* in the very habits themselves.

3. Whereas you say, in the close of *Section the* 28, that the consent of the *Schoole-men* is no waies denying, but asserting a capacity of degrees amongst the acts of Christs love of God, *i. e.* of the inward acts thereof. There will be little sense in your words in themselves, and lesse pertinency unto the matter in hand, unlesse your meaning be, as you elsewhere expresse your selfe, that the inward acts of Christs love of God were more intense at one time, than at another: and if this be your meaning, I must needs assume the boldnesse to tell you, that no such matter is visible unto me in any of the

School-

Schoole-men. But perhaps you may meane ſuch *Schoole-men*, as ſuch a *Puny*, as I, never ſaw or heard of; however you cannot expect beleife, untill you produce their teſtimonies: And I ſhall entreat you to alleadge ſuch, as may be had in *Pauls-church-yard*, or at leaſt in the *Library* at *Oxford*.

Dr HAMMOND.

29. *Secondly, he will heare the Doctors objection, and conſider of what weight it is.*

Objection? againſt what? againſt the *fulneſſe of habituall grace in Chriſt?* ſure never any was by me urged againſt it. And he cannot now *think* there was. The degrees of *intenſeneſſe* obſervable in the ſeverall *acts of Chriſts love*, his *praying* more *ardently at one time than another*, was all that *I* concluded from that *text*, *Luk.* 22.44. and that is nothing to his *habituall love*.

IEANES.

That this objection was not intended by you againſt the fulneſſe of Chriſts habituall grace, upon your proteſtation, I readily believe; but, that by conſequence it reacheth it, I thus make good. That objection which is urged againſt the perpetuall allfulneſſe & perfection of Chriſts actuall love, the inward acts of his love of God, ſtrikes againſt the perpetuall allfulneſſe & perfection of his habitual love: becauſe the degrees of the inward acts of his love of God are commenſurate unto the degrees of his habituall love. For they have no degrees at all, but *ſecundariò*, in regard of the habit of his love: but now this objection is urged by you againſt the perpetuall all-fulneſſe and perfection of his actuall love, the inward acts of his love; for it is brought to prove that the inward acts of Chriſts love were more intenſe at one time than another, and a greater intenſion preſuppoſeth remiſſion and imperfection; for *intenſio eſt eductio rei intenſæ de imperfecto ad perfectum*, as *Aquinas* very often. Therefore this objection ſtrikes againſt the perpetuall fulneſſe and perfection of Chriſts actuall love of God, and ſo conſequently againſt the perpetuall fulneſſe and perfection of his habituall love.

30. But even to this he is pleased to frame *Answers* (though I hope his *doctrine* of the *fulnesse of Christs habituall grace* be no way *concern'd* in it) and to these I shall briefly attend him, as my *last* stage in this no very long voyage.

31. *And 1. saith he, the vulgar translation renders* ἐκτενέστερον, *prolixius*; and *if this version be good, then there is no place for the Doctors objection.*

But though I seeke no *advantage* by that *vulgar* reading, yet thinking it a duty of *reverence* to that *version*, to take leave *civilly* whensoever I *depart* from it (wherein I have the suffrage of *Protestants* as *learned* in both the *Languages Hebrew* and *Greek*, as any) and that I may to the utmost observe the *Refuters* steps, I shall not utterly *reject* it.

32. Tis certain ἐκτενὴς doth primarily signifie *extension*, and that properly belongs to *length*, and so the *comparative* ἐκτενέστερον to a *greater degree* of that *length*. And if it be granted that it so signifie here, there will yet be *place equally for my conclusion*.

33. For in every *act* of *Prayer*, be it but the *shortest* ejaculation sent out by *Christ*, *I* suppose (and my *Refuter* must not *doubt* of it) there was some *degree* of *ardency* or *intension*; And then sure according to the *multiplying* of those *acts lengthening* that *prayer*, there must still in *Christ*, (I say not in every one of us) be a *proportionable* multiplication of those *degrees*, and so *parallel* to a greater *length*, a greater *intension*.

FEANES.

The answer here is very easy and obvious; the *intension* of the degrees of the inward acts of Christs love of God may be said to be greater either in regard of the *number*, or in respect of the *intensive perfection* and excellency of those degrees; according to the lengthning of Christs prayer there is a multiplying of inward acts of his love, and proportionably a multiplication of the degrees of his love, and consequently a greater intension of those degrees, in regard of their number, but not in respecct of their *intensive* perfection, or excellency. For in Christ let them be never so much multiplied, they may be and still are of an equall intensive perfection, and excellency, one is not more intense than another; and so if this reading

ding be retained, there will be no place for your concluſion; That the inward acts of Chriſts love are more intenſe at one time than another, unleſſe you will make intẽſion to be a meere coacervation of *hõo geneous* degrees (*i.e*) degrees altogether like: the abſurdity of which you may ſee in *Suarez Met. diſ. 46. & Pet. Hurtado de Mendoza. de Gener. & Corrupt. diſp. 5. §. 6.*

Sir, here I am very confident that you preſumed very much on my ignorance, otherwiſe you would never have gone about to have impoſed upon me ſo poore and ſorry a ſophiſme, as is in the equivocation of the word *greater*, which is eaſily diſcoverable by a *freſh-man:* for that you your ſelfe ſhould be ignorant of ſuch an ordinary *homonymy*, I am loath to harbour ſuch diſhonourable thoughts of your abilities in philoſophy as to imagine.

Dr *HAMMOND*.

34. This is *cleare*, and *I* need not adde, what elſe I might, that the very *multiplication* of *more acts* of any *virtue*, ſuppoſing it equally *ſincere* in the *habit*, and ſuch is the length of prayer, when it is in Chriſt, is more *valuable* in the ſight of God, and that argues it more *excellent*, than the *ſmaller* number of thoſe acts would be, and proportionably more *abundantly rewarded* by him, who rewardeth every man not only according to the *ſincerity* of his *heart*, but alſo *ſecundum opera*, according to the *multiplied acts* or *workes*, the more abundant labour proceeding from this *ſincerity*. And ſo that will ſuffice for his firſt anſwer.

JEANES.

1. This is an utter impertinency unto that which is in debate between us. For ſuppoſe that the very multiplication of more inward acts of any virtue in Chriſt is more valuable in the ſight of God, and ſo more excellent than the ſmaller number of thoſe acts would be; yet this ſuppoſition will never bring you to this concluſion, that one inward act of Chriſts love of God may be more intenſe than another; and my reaſon is, becauſe in all theſe inward acts of Chriſts love of God (and we may ſay the ſame of the inward acts of

other

other virtues and graces) there may be no graduall dissimilitude.

2. A great part of the *Schoolemen* will tell you, that the morall value of one single act of any virtue in Christ was infinite, and in the multiplication of more acts there is but an infinite value: now one infinite cannot be greater than another infinite in the same kind, wherein it is infinite, and hereupon they conclude that the multiplication of acts makes nothing in Christ unto an intensive addition of value, the value of one act is intensively as great as that of more acts. The first act of Christ (saies *Albertinus*) *habet totam latitudinem intensivam valoris moralis, et si non adæquet totam latitudinem extensivam*: *Corol. tom.* 1. 150. *n.*61. And of this you have a reason. *p.*145. this act is *à personâ divinâ, tanquam à forma intrinsecâ; quæ intrinsecè denominatur operans, ab ipsâ operatione quæ est in naturâ humanâ, et ut sic est illimitabilis àconditionibus actûs*. Unto *Albertinus* I shall subjoine *Suarez* who speakes to the same purpose *in tertiam par. Thom. Tom.* 1 *disput.* 4. *sect.* 4. *pag.* 49. *Plura opera Christi sunt quidem extensivè plura merita; intensivè tamen non est plus valoris in multis quam in uno; ut, si essent plures calores infinitè intensi, essent quidem plures, non tamen efficerent unum intensiorem; & paritatione, si in uno opere Christi, quod successivè per partes fiebat, partes cum toto comparemus, intensivè tantus valor erat in quâlibet parte, sicut in toto opere, & in uno momento, sicut in longo tempore; quia forma à quâ erat valor, tota erat in toto, & tota in singulis partibus.*

Dr HAMMOND.

35. "But then, 2. Saith he, suppose we stick unto our own "translation, yet the place may fairely be so interpreted, as that it "may no waies advantage the purpose of the Doctor. For ἐκτενέστερον, more earnestly, may be considered in reference unto "either the object unto whom he prayed, God; or the matter "against which he prayed, the evills with which he conflicted in his "agony.

1. The

1. Then, saith he, he did not in his agony pray more earnestly than at other times, if we consider his prayer in reference unto the object, unto whom it was, God. The religion, and inward worship of his prayer, was for degrees alwaies alike equal. His trust and dependance upon God, love of zeal and devotion towards God, from which all his prayers flowed, were not at one time more intense than at another.

But now 2. He prayed more earnestly in his agony than at other times, in regard of the matter, against which he prayed. the evills which he encountred with, which if they were not greater, then those that he deprecated in the former prayer, *v.* 42. yet at least they made a greater impression upon his humane nature; for they put him into a bloody sweat. *Being* in an agony he prayed more earnestly, & his sweat was as it were drops of blood, falling down to the ground.

36. These are the words of his *second answer*, and they are in the second part, the very *distinct confession* of all that I pretend in this matter (and therefore I need not make any *reflections* on the *first* part of them) For whatsoever, or how great soever the *occasion* of the *increase* of his *intension* was (which *I* am willing to believe *proportionable* to the *degree* of the *intension*, a very weighty *occasion* that thus inflamed his *ardency*) yet still, 'tis confest, that on this *occasion*, he now prayed *more earnestly* than at the *other times*, that which now approached made a *greater impression on his humane nature*; which what is it but a *proofe* of the point by me asserted, that *Christ* himselfe was *more ardent in one act of prayer* (this in his *agonie*) than in *another*.

37. As for the *greatnesse* of the *occasion*, so *professedlie great* as to *cast him into that prodigious sweat*, falling ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος, *as it were drops of blood*, that may *testifie*, but it cannot *prejudg* the *ardency* which was occasioned thereby.

38. 'Twas not in *Christ*, he will easily suppose with me) as it is oft discernable in *many* of *us*, that those which really have no *sincerity* of *love* or *zeal* to *God*, can yet, like the *Marriners* in the *tempest*, by some pressing *fear* or danger be awaked to, but *formall*; and, be they never so *loud*, but *hypocritically zealous* prayers.

39. The *ardency* in *Christ* was *sincere ardency*, accompanied with *acts* of *love* and *trust* of the same *temper*, and the heightning it ἐκτενέστερον, was an *addition* of *degrees* to that *act* of *ardency*, and so of *prayer*, and proportionably of *love* and *trust* in *God*, above either what there was, or what there was *occasion* for, at *other* times.

JEANES.

1. First you pretend in *Sect.* 21. of this your reply that the inward acts of Christs love of God were more intense at one time than another. Now this is not contained expresly, nor can it by any *logick* be inferred from the words of the second part of my second answer, that *he prayed more earnestly in his agony than at other times, in regard of the matter against which he prayed, &c.* and therefore this second part of my second answer is not the very distinct confession of all that you pretend in this matter; and therefore notwithstanding them, you must make reflections on the first part of my answer, or else you will never reply thereunto.

2. That the ardency in Christ was a sincere ardency, is not doubted of; all the question is, what ardency it was in Christ that was heightned: there was, as I plainly intimated in my answer, a twofold *ardency* in Christs prayer, one *regarding God*, unto whom he prayed, and this was seated in the acts of love and trust *tanquam modus in re modificatâ*: Another *respected the matter against which he prayed*, and the *res modificata* of this ardency was the acts of feare of, and greife for those evills with which he encountred. I readily grant the heightning of this latter ardency, so that there was in his agony an addition of degrees unto his feare of, and greife for those evils against which he prayed, above either what there

there was, or what there was occasion for at other times: but as for the former ardency *regarding God*, and placed in the inward acts of his love of God, &c. that was uncapable of further heightning: for his actuall love of God was *in termino*, as they say, was alwaies at the highest, and most intense; and this I shall not barely dictate: but prove by three arguments, which I present unto you to be examined, as rigidly as you please.

1. The all-fulnesse and perfection of Christs habituall grace.

2. His perpetuall and uninterrupted happinesse.

3. His impeccability.

1. The first argument, which hath been already so fully insisted upon, is the all-fulnesse and perfection of Christs habituall grace; the habits of all graces and virtues in Christ were alwaies full and perfect, most intense and not capable of farther or higher degrees, and therefore so were the inward acts of those graces and virtues too, and particularly the inward acts of the habituall grace of divine charity. The consequence of this Enthymeme hath been already sufficiently proved, and therefore I shall add nothing for further confirmation of it, but the testimony of some few Schoole-men. *Aquinas*, as *Capreolus* quotes him *lib.* 1. *dist.* 17. *qu.* 2. *fol:* 306. hath this passage. *Nihil inquit aliud est qualitatem augeri quam subjectùm magis participare qualitatem. Non enim aliud est esse qualitatis nisi quod habet in subjecto, ex hoc autem ipso quod subjectum magis participat charitatem vehementius operatur, quia unumquodque operatur in quantum est actu.* *Aquinas* thought (you see) that a greater vehemency in the operations of love, argued a greater participation in the subject of the habits of love. And againe *secundâ secundæ qu.* 24. *art.* 4. *ad tertium. Similiter*

charitas essentialiter est virtus ordinata ad actum, unde idem est ipsam augeri secundum essentiam, & ipsam habere efficaciam ad producendum ferventioris dilectionis actum. Unto this I shall adde a third place out of *Aquinas* quoted by *Capreolus lib. 3. dis. 27,28,29,30. pag. 209. Cum actus & habitus speciem habent ex objecto, oportet quod ex eodem ratio perfectionis ipsius sumatur. Objectum autem charitatis est summum bonum; igitur perfecta charitas est, quæ in summum bonum fertur in tantum in quantum est diligibile.* The habit of love is then perfect, when tis carried towards God as the cheife, when God is loved so farre forth as he may be loved, to wit, by a creature: when God is not loved thus intensely, the habit of love (as *Aquinas* thought) was imperfect. With *Aquinas* also *Scotus* accords *l. 3. dis. 13. q. 3. Possibile est animã Christi habere summam gratiam, ergo summam fruitionem. Consequentia probatur, quia actus naturaliter elicitus ab aliquâ formâ, æquatur in perfectione illi formæ.* Unto these two great *Schoole-men*, I shall adde the testimony of a *Philosopher* of great subtilty and repute *Pet. Hurt. de Mendoza. De An. dis. 16. sect. 8. p. 672. Intensio actus secundi supponit æqualem intensionem in actu primo, cum actus secundus supponat primum.*

A second argument is drawn from the perpetuall and *uninterrupted* happinesse of Christ: it is resolved both by *Aquinas 3a. q. 34. art. 4. Scotus lib. 3. disp. 18.* and their followers, that Christ in regard of his Soule was even here in this life, from the very first moment of his conception, all his life long unto his death *perfectus comprehensor*; and therefore he injoyed in his soule all that was necessary unto heaven happinesse: and I find learned *Protestants* herein consenting with them; now tis the unanimous opinion of the *Schoole-men* that a most intense

tenſe actuall love of God, an actuall love of God for degrees as high, as ardent, as fervent, as is according to Gods ordinary power poſſible unto, the humane nature, doth neceſſarily belong to the heaven happineſſe of men. The *Scotiſts* place the very *formality* of happineſſe ſolely herein, and *Suarez* with others think it eſſentiall unto happineſſe, though he ſuppoſeth the eſſence of happineſſe not to conſiſt wholly or cheifly in it. And for the reſt of the *Thomiſts*, who hold that the eſſence of happineſſe ſtands onely in the *beatificall viſion* of God, why even they make this actuall moſt intenſe love of God a naturall and neceſſary conſequent of the *beatifique viſion*. By this that hath been ſaid it is evident, that whereas you averre that the inward acts of Chriſts love of God were leſſe intenſe at one time than another, (for ſo you affirme in ſaying they were more intenſe at one time than at another) you deny Chriſt to be happy and bleſſed at thoſe times wherein his inward acts of love were thus leſſe intenſe, and that this is *propoſitio malè ſonans*, harſhly ſounding in the eares of Chriſtians, that are jealous of their redeemers honour, will I hope be ingeniouſly confeſſed by your ſelfe upon a review of it. Adde hereunto that the Schoolemen generally conſent, as unto a propoſition that is piouſly credible, that the happineſſe of Chriſts ſoule did even during the whole time of his abode here, farre ſurmount that of all the Saints, and Angells in heaven: but if the inward acts of his love of God were leſſe intenſe at one time than another, the bliſſe of his Soule would have come farre ſhort of that of the loweſt Saint in heaven; for the actuall love of the loweſt Saint was not, is not more intenſe at one time than another, but alwaies full and perfect; and therefore uncapable

uncapable of further and higher degrees.

The third and laſt argument, is fetched from Chriſts impeccability; it was impoſſible for Chriſt to ſinne: but if the inward acts of his love of God had been leſſe intenſe at one time than at another, he had ſinned; for he had broken that firſt and great commandment, thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy Soule, with all thy mind, with all thy might, and ſtrength. *Deut.* 6. 5. *Matth.* 22. 37. *Mark.* 12. 30. *Luk.* 10. 27. For this commandment enjoyneth the moſt intenſe actuall love of God, that is poſſible; an actuall love of him *tanto nixu & conatu quanto fieri poteſt (i. e.)* as much as may be; what better and more probable gloſſe can we put on that clauſe, thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy ſtrength or might, ὅλης τῆ ἰσχύος σου, then thou ſhalt love him with thy uttermoſt force and endeavour: ſutable hereunto is that interpretation which *Aquinas* giveth of thoſe words thou ſhalt love the Lord with all thy heart (i. e.) ſaith he *ex toto poſſe tuo*, with as high a degree of actuall love as thou art able to reach unto. *Deus eſt totaliter diligendus, poteſt intelligi ita quod totalitas referatur ad diligentem: & ſic etiam Deus totaliter diligi debet; quia ex toto poſſe ſuo homo debet diligere deum, & quicquid habet, ad dei amorem ordinare; ſecundum illud Deuter.* 6. *Diliges dominum deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, 2 da 2 dæ, q.* 27. *art.* 5. But now Chriſt man had in him as great abilities for the actuall love of God as Adam in Paradiſe, as the Saints and Angels in heaven; for an all-fulneſſe of the grace and virtue of love dwelled in him, and therefore if the inward acts of his love were leſſe intenſe at one time, than another; then ſomtimes when he actually loved God, he did not love him

him as intenſly, as ardently, as fervently as he could, he did not love him with all his might, and ſtrength, *ex toto poſſe ſuo*, and ſo conſequently he fulfilled not all righteouſneſſe; for his obedience unto this commandment would have been by this your opinion imperfect and ſinfull, which, but to imagine were blaſphemy. But you will be ready to tell me, that you have prevented this charge, by that expoſition of thoſe large incluſive words, thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy Soule &c. which you have given in your treatiſe of will-worſhip, which I ſhall tranſcribe and briefly examine.

Once more, if it be objected that what ever is thus performed, is commanded by thoſe large incluſive words, [*thou ſhalt love thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy Soule &c.*] *nothing being of ſuch latitude, as that the* (*with all*) *ſhould not contain it. I anſwer, that that phraſe denoteth two things only.*

1. *Sincerity of this love of God, as oppoſed to partiall divided love, or ſervice.*

2. *The loving him above all other things, and not admitting any thing into Competition with him; not loving any thing elſe in ſuch a degree. Treat: wil-worſh. p.* 24.

Here you barely dictate, that that phraſe, [Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy Soule &c.] denoteth onely thoſe two things, you mention, whereas your reader hath juſt reaſon to expect a confirmation of what you ſay.

1. Becauſe this very anſwer is the ſhift of Papiſts in ſeverall controverſies between them and us, *Bellarm. Tom.* 2. *De monachis. lib.* 2. *cap.* 13. *Tom.* 4. *de amiſſione*

amiſsione gratiæ, & Statu peccati lib: 1. *cap.* 12. *&c.* And was it not fit that you ſhould acquaint us, what thoſe cogent reaſons were, that neceſſitated you unto this compliançe with Papiſts?

2. Thoſe proteſtants, that have dealt in the controverſies betwixt us and the Papiſts, have proved this your ſenſe to be too narrow, and with-all have given another expoſition (*a*) of the words which they have confirmed and vindicated from the exceptions of the Papiſts. Now of all this, it had been equitable for you to have taken notice, and not to have troubled your reader with that which hath been ſo abundantly refuted by Proteſtant pens. But to take a ſunder this anſwer into its parts.

(*a*) Nimirùm huc tandem res redit, ut ſciamus ita imperari nobis amorem Dei, ut nullus ſit amoris gradus, intra ſummum, cui quiſquam debeat acquieſcere. ſummum autem dico non tantum comparatè ad res alias, quæ ſub amorem cadunt: ſed etiam, & quidem præcipuè comparatè ad nos ipſos, ut nè ultrà poſſimus amare: Ita enim verè totum cor erit tota anima: mens tota vires omnes, &c. *Chamier. Tom.* 3. *lib.* 11. *cap.* 16. *ſect.* 22.

The phraſe denoteth 1. *ſincerity of this love of God, as oppoſed to partiall divided love, or ſervice*; Unto this I ſhall reply. 1. In the words of *Ames* unto *Bellarmine*: *Bellar: Enervat: Tom.* 2. *p.* 154. *Hoc aliquid eſt, ſed non totum quod his verbis præcipitur, tum enim illi etiam qui minimum gradum veræ charitatis, quamvis tepidi fuerint, hoc preceptum perfectè implerent.* This is ſomething, but it is not all that is commanded in theſe words, for then thoſe that have the leaſt degree of true charity, although they were lukewarme ſhould perfectly fulfill this command.

2. To *Ames* his words, I ſhall adde thoſe of the Dr. *Francis White* (one that was farre from *Puritaniſme*) in his

his reply to the *Jesuite Fishers* answer: *If the precept, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart &c. bind men no further than to an unfained or sincere love of God, and the observance of his commandements without breach of friendship, then it bindeth them not to the shunning of veniall sins. But according to Austin and Bernard, it bindeth man to the avoiding of all sin, both veniall and mortall. But proceed we on to the second part of your answer. That phrase denoteth Secondly, the loving him above all other things, and not admitting any thing into competition with him: not loving any thing else in such a degree.* The *Schoole-men* tell us that God may be loved above all things three manner of waies, *objectivè, appretiativè*, and *intensivè:* now which of these waies it is that you imbrace, or whether you imbrace all of them I cannot determine, and therefore I shall waite untill you declare your selfe, and accordingly shall shape mine answer. But in the meane while, that this commandement enjoineth a most intense actuall love of God, a love of God with as high a degree as is possible unto the humane nature, I shall evince by these following reasons.

1. It cannot be denied but that the intension, and degrees of love fall all under the commandement of love it selfe: for as *Aquinas noteth secundâ secundæ quest. 44. art. 8. Modus, qui pertinet ad rationem virtuosi actûs, cadit sub precepto, quod datur de actu virtutis. This præmised I thus argue:* Either the loweſt degree, or some middle degree, or the higheſt degree

of actuall love, is here commanded; if the loweſt, then that is a perfect fulfilling of this law, and the luke-warmneſſe of love can be no ſin; if you ſay ſome one of the middle degrees betwixt the loweſt and the higheſt, it concerneth you to determine, and ſpecify what degree this is, below which all degrees of love are ſinfull, and beyond which all degrees of love are a voluntary oblation and uncommanded worſhip; and if you cannot do this (as I know you cannot) I ſhall conclude, that the higheſt degree is commanded in our love of God.

2. A moſt intenſe love of God, a love of him with the utmoſt of our forces and endeavors is due unto God *debito connaturalitatis, & debito gratitudinis*, 1. *debito connaturalitatis*, by an obligation of congruence, for it is very fitting that we love him as much as we can, who is infinitely good in himſelfe, and therefore the cheife good, and ſupreame end of man. The Proteſtants are brought in by *Bellarmine de Mon. Lib. 2. cap. 13.* thus objecting againſt their popiſh evangelicall counſells of perfection, that he that is unwilling to love God as much as he can, doth hereby deny, to wit virtually and interpretatively, that God is the cheife good of man; and whereas he is ſo bold in his anſwer to affirme, that *non requiritur ut quis ſummum bonum tam ardenter amet, quam fortè poſſet:* *Ames* hath hereunto a very round and acute reply, *tum non requiritur* (ſaith he) *ut in bonum omni ratione ſummum feramur, affectu omni etiam ratione ſummo.*

2. This moſt intenſe actuall love of God is due unto God by an obligation of gratitude, for hereby (as Dr *Francis*

tis White against *Fisher* out of *Bernard*) we are indebted and owe to the almighty, *omne quod sumus, & omne quod possumus*, whatsoever we are, & whatsoever we are able to do.

For the further confirmation of this point, Protestants alleadge the testimonies of divers of the Fathers, particularly *Austin* and *Bernard*, as also of the ancient Schoole-men, who say that this command cannot be fulfilled in this life; becauſe it commands such a perfection of love, as is impossible to be attained in this life. I shall not clog the readers patience with transcribing the severall quotations, becauſe I beleive he may have them almost in every writer of controversies betwixt us and the Papists: onely I shall trouble him with what I conceive to be most remarkeable in *Aquinas* and *Scotus* concerning this mater. 1. *Aquinas secunda secundæ qu.* 44 *.art.6. intendit deus per hoc præceptum Deut. 6. ut homo deo totaliter uniatur; quod fiet in patriâ, quando deus erit omnia in omnibus,* 1 *Cor.* 15. *& ideo plenè & perfectè in patriâ implebitur hoc præceptum.* And againe. *qu.* 184. *art.* 3. *Non autem dilectio dei & proximi cadit sub præcepto secundum aliquam mensuram, ita quòd id quod est plus, sub consilio remaneat; ut patet ex ipsâ formâ præcepti, quæ perfectionem demonstrat; ut cum dicitur, diliges dominum deum ex toto corde tuo: totum enim & perfectum idem sunt sec. Phil.* 3. *phys. & cum dicitur, diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum: unusquisque enim se ipsum maximè diligit. Et hoc ideo est, quia finis præcepti charitas est, ut Apostolus* 1 *Tim.* 1. *in fine autem non adhibetur aliqua mensura, sed solum in his quæ sunt*

ad finem, ut philosophus dicit 1. *polit. Sicut medicus non adhibet mensuram quantum sanet, sed quanta medicina vel dieta utatur ad sanandum.* Thus also *Scotus lib.*3. *dist.* 27. *dico igitur quod illud præceptum, Deut.*6. *non potest impleri in viâ, quantum ad omnes conditiones, quæ exponuntur per illas additiones ex toto cordè, & ex totâ anima, &c. quià non potest esse in viâ istâ tanta recollectio virium, ut amotis impedimentis possit voluntas tanto conatu ferri, quanto posset, si vires essent unitæ, & non impeditæ, & quod ad talem intensionem actus expulsis impedimentis, & recollectis viribus debet intelligi dictum Aug. et magistri, quod præceptum illud non impletur in viâ; nam promtas virium inferiorum pro statu isto impedit superiores ab actibus perfectis.* The first that *Bellarmine* hath to evade these testimonies is not unknowne unto me, viz. that they are to be understood of the command *quatenus indicant finem, non quatenus præcipit medium*; if you think fit to adventure hereupon, I must needs intreat you to remove first out of your way the replies of *Chamier* and *Ames* unto it.

Thirdly you seeme in the latter end of *section the* 39. to intimate, that in the time of Christs agony there was more occasion for the heightning of his love of God than there was at other times. What you meane by these ocasiõs of heightning Christs love of God that you intimate, I will not undertake to guesse; but this I am sure of, that at all other times he had sufficient causes, grounds, and motives to induce him to love God with as heightned degrees of Actuall love as the humane nature could reach unto; he injoied the beatificall vision,

a cleare, evident, and intuitive knowledg of the divine essence, that had in it all the fulnesse of goodnes, and so was an object infinitely lovely and amiable: Now such an Object thus known, thus seen, challengeth such a measure of actuall love, as that it leaveth no place for a farther and higher degree. The *Thomists* generally maintaine that this most intense love of God is a naturall, and necessary sequele of the beatificall vision, necessary *quoad exercitium*, as well as *quoad specificationem actûs*; now that which works naturally and necessarily, works as vehemently and forcibly as it can. *Omne agens de necessitate, necessariò agit usque ad ultimum potentiæ suæ*; therefore the inward acts of Christs love of God were alwaies as ardent, and fervent as he could performe them, and therefore some were not more intense than others; for if we speak of a *liberty of indifferency, and indetermination*, he had no more liberty towards the intension of the inward acts of his love, than he had towards the acts themselves.

Dr. *HAMMOND.*

40. Of this I shall hope it is *possible* to finde some *instances* among men (of whose *graces* it can be no *blasphemy* to affirme, that they are *capable of degrees*) suppose we *a sincerely pious* man, a true *lover* of *God*, and no *despiser* of his *poore persecuted Church*, and suppose we, as it is very supposeable, that at *some* time the *seas roar*, the *tempest* be at its *height*, and the *waves beat* violently upon this *frail brittle* vessell, may it not be a *season* for that *pious* mans *ardency* to receive some *growth*? for his *zeal* to be *emulous* of those

waves

waves, and poure it selfe out more *profusely* at such, than at a *calmer season?* I hope there be some at *this* time among us, in whom this *point* is really *exemplified*; if it be not, it is an effect of *want*, not *fulnesse* of *love*. But I *need* not thus to *inlarge*, It is not by this *Refuter* denied of the *person* of *Christ*, and that is my *intire* ὅυπερ ἕστε σεῖξαι in reference either to *Mr. C.* or to *him*, the *utmost* that *I* undertook to *demonstrate* then, or to justify now.

Ieanes.

This Section your *poore refuter* had passed over as a digression, had he not found himselfe named in the close of it; *it is not by this refuter denyed of the person of Christ.* I suppose the antecedent to the relative is in these words, *may it not be a season for that pious mans ardency to receive some growth? for his zeale to be emulous of those waves, and poure it selfe out more profusely at such than at a calmer season?* And then there be two things that you affirme, that I deny not of the person of Christ.

1. That a tempestuous time (a time of affliction) was a season for Christs ardency to receive some growth.

2. That twas a season for his zeale to poure it selfe out more profusely at such, than at a calmer season.

As for the first sentence, a time of affliction was a season for Christs ardency to receive some growth, if by ardency you understand the ardency of his love of God, I deny that it did receive any growth; for to ascribe growth unto it is to charge it with imperfection

fection. *Charitas, quamdiu augeri poteſt* (ſaith Auſtin) *profectò illud quod minus eſt quàm debet, ex vitio eſt.* And I am very confident that beſides this replyer, no learned man either proteſtant; or papiſt hath aſcribed any ſuch growth unto the ardency of Chriſts actuall love of God.

As for the ſecond ſentence, that a tempeſtuous time, a time of Chriſts affliction *was a ſeaſon for his zeale to poure it's ſelfe out more profuſely than at a calmer ſeaſon*, this is not (I grant) denied by me, if by *this more profuſe pouring out of his zeale* you only underſtand the outward expreſſions of his zeale; but I cannot but extreamly wonder that you affirme this to be the utmoſt, that you undertook to demonſtrate to Mr. Cawdrey, or to juſtify now againſt me &c.

For 1. in your anſwer to *Mr. Cawdrey*, you affirme by conſequent, that Chriſts love of God was capable of farther and higher degrees, but love is predicated of the outward expreſſions thereof only *analogically, analogiâ attributionis extrinſecæ, ſicut ſanitas dicitur de urina.*

2. In this your reply unto me you expreſly averre, that the inward acts of Chriſts love of God were more intenſe at one time, than another *Sect.* 21. and I hope you have more philoſophy, then to confound the inward acts, and the outward expreſſions of love.

That which hath herein occaſioned your miſtake is, I beleeve, a ſuppoſall that the inward acts of love, and the outward expreſſions thereof are, if they be ſincere

ſincere, alwaies exactly proportioned in point of degree; but this propoſition hath no truth in it, as you will ſoone find, if you attempt the proofe of it, who almoſt but may eaſily conceive how 'tis very ordinary for the outward expreſſions of love to be gradually beneath the inward acts thereof? he is no hypocrite in expreſſing his love, that loveth inwardly more than he expreſſeth outwardly; the degrees then of the inward acts of love may not only equall, but alſo tranſcend the moſt ſincere expreſſions of love. It may be ſo in all men, and I ſhall alleadge two reaſons, why in Chriſt the inward acts of his love were alwaies equally intenſe, though the outward expreſſions thereof were gradually different.

The firſt reaſon agreeth unto Chriſt in common with other men. Chriſt as man was alwaies obliged unto the moſt intenſe, ardent, and fervent inward acts of love of God, but he was not alwaies obliged unto the moſt intenſe expreſſions of theſe inward acts; the reaſon of the difference betweene his obligation unto the intenſion of the inward acts of his love, and his obligation unto the intenſion of the outward expreſſions thereof, you may fetch from what is ſaid by *Aquinas* 2 *da* 2 *dæ*, *q.* 27. *art.* 6. *ad tertiam. Nec eſt ſimile de interiori actu charitatis & exterioribus actibus. Nam interior actus charitatis habet rationem finis, quià ultimum bonum hominis conſiſtit in hoc, quod anima Deo inhæreat, ſecundum illud Pſalmi, mihi adhærere deo bonum eſt. Exteriores autem actus ſunt ſicut ad finem, & ideo ſunt commenſurandi,*

commensurandi, & secundum charitatem, & secundum rationem.

The second reason is peculiar unto Christ above all other men: Whil'st he lived here upon earth, he injoyed the *beatificall vision*; and the naturall, and necessary consequent thereof is a most intense actuall love of God, and therefore the inward acts of his love of God were equally intense at all times: but as for the outward expressions of these acts, Christ had to them a proper freedome, taking the word [freedome] for an *active indifferency, in sensu diviso*, and therefore they might be more intense at one time than another; but of this you may, if you please, see further in *Suarez in tertiam partem Thom: dis.* 37. *sect.* 4. where the question debated is *quomodo voluntas Christi ex necessitate diligens deum, in reliquis actibus potuerit esse libera.*

Dr *HAMMOND.*

41. And so I shut up this *hasty* paper, hoping that he which *invited* and *promised* it a *welcome*, in case it were given in a *fair and Scholasticall way*, having nothing to accuse in it as to the *first Epithet*, will *abate* somewhat in reference to the second, and allow it a *friendly*, though being *unqualified*, it pretend not to a more *hospitable reception.*

FEANES.

Unto this your *hasty* paper (as you call it) I have given a *deliberate* answer; and I hope it may contend with your reply for civility, and faireneſſe in carriage of the controversy between us. As for the *Scholasticall-*

F134905
J506

neſſe of either paper, it were a vaine thing for me to ſay any thing of it; for we muſt be tried by the learned *readers*, unto whom we both have, by thus appearing in publique, appealed; and unto their judgment I ſhall contentedly ſubmit my ſelfe. And thus your *refuter*, for the preſent, takes his leave of you, hoping, when your more *pleaſing and profitable imployments* ſhall permit, to heare further from you; in the meane time he ſhall reſt: Your moſt humble ſervant

HENRY JEANES.

FINIS.